



1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
, з	Case No. 11-13463-dwh
4	X
5	In the Matter of:
6	
7	MARITIME COMMUNICATIONS/LAND MOBILE, LLC
8	
9	Debtor.
10	
11	
12	
13	United States Bankruptcy Court
14	Thad Cochran U.S. Courthouse
15	703 Hwy 145 North
16	Aberdeen, Mississippi
17	
18	November 15, 2012
19	9:35 a.m.
20	
21	
22	BEFORE:
23	HON. DAVID W. HOUSTON, III
24	U.S. BANKRUPTCY CHIEF JUDGE
25	

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	CRAIG M. GENO, PLLC
3	Attorneys for Debtors
4	Post Office Box 3380
5	Ridgeland, Mississippi 39158
6	
7	BY: CRAIG M. GENO, ESQ.
8	
9	BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN, CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, P.C.
LO	Attorneys for Southeastern Commercial Finance & Choctow
11	Investors
12	1400 Wachovia Tower
13	420 North 20th Street
14	Birmingham, Alabama 35203
15	
16	BY: TIMOTHY M. LUPINACCI, ESQ.
17	
18	BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN, CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, P.C.
19	Attorneys for Southeastern Commercial Finance
20	201 St. Charles Avenue
21	Suite 3600
22	New Orleans, Louisiana 70170
23	
24	BY: JAN HAYDEN, ESQ.
25	

Part 1

releases and those sorts of things in the plan that can be read to not preserve them. That's our concern, Your Honor.

So it appears that no one is going to have a problem with the order clarifying that those things are preserved like the Court's past orders have done. If that's the case, then that would resolve that concern of Skytel.

And in our objection we set forth some language that we request be in the confirmation order in the alternative if the Court chooses to confirm it. That is either identical or very similar to the past language that's been in this Court's orders. And we would for that -- for the reason of the releases and broad exculpatory clause language that I mentioned, we would request that that sort of language be in this Court's order if the Court confirms the plan.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

(Pause)

THE COURT: I have been making notes up here while you were all giving me your summations and I worked on this during the time we were out for lunch also.

I'm going to make the last comment at this hearing about Second Thursday. I heard a lot of testimony about it.

Harkens of testimony of Samuel Fader (ph) formal counsel, former chief counsel to the FCC who is (indiscernible) qualified to testify about Second Thursday. He said there

were three requirements that had to be met.

The first was that the licensee is in bankruptcy.

Clearly that's the situation here.

Number two, the alleged -- alleged wrongdoer is not participating with the transferee. That's pretty undisputed as far as the proof I've heard today.

And number three, the alleged wrongdoer will receive no benefit or only incidental benefit that would not be exceeded by the benefit to the creditors who would be paid by the transaction.

Now, there is absolutely no guarantee that Second Thursday is going to be granted by the FCC. And I'm not sitting up here trying to say to the FCC, you've got to grant Second Thursday. That's not my function. That's the function of the FCC and I said that from the time this case started. I am not trying to superimpose this Court's judgment on that agency.

The FCC may look to a lot of things such as value and compare those values to the debts that are being treated in this transaction. While I'm certainly not establishing a value the debtor's spectrum, because as I said earlier today it is a moving target that could be affected by many variables. Of course one variable is the ability to be treated pursuant to the Second Thursday doctrine.

Secondly the value could be effected by the

treatment of certain of these assignee entities pursuant to footnote 7 in the opinion, such as Southern California 2 Regional Railway Authority. And that to me is one of the 3 most compelling factors in this entire case as to what went on out there with that train wreck in California that 5 prompted congressional legislation that has now put Southern 6 California Railway Authority into the position of having to 7 8 do something to comply with the congressional act and it's 9 under a deadline to do so for obvious reasons of public safety. To me that's one of the most compelling stories 10 that I've heard throughout the history of this case. And of 11 course the existence of the Skytel challenges at every level 12

have certainly impacted the valuation of spectrum.

We look to this question of windfall and you have to compare it to the risk involved. I thought Mr. Reardon was very candid in his testimony yesterday that when he valued the spectrum from zero to perhaps \$45 million -- \$40- to \$45 million and then he said at a fire sale it might have value of \$8- to \$10 million. Well that's clearly a moving target and that's what I think that it is.

You look at the debt related to this value and that's why when Professor Chen was testifying I looked back at my own notes and I looked at the amount of debt involved. You've got the secured debt that could range between -- in my recollection 15- to 17 million. You've got the voting

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

unsecured creditors that voted in this case 23 million. 1 You've got the administrative claims in this case of an undetermined amount right now. And then you've got as Mr. 3

Spencer just mentioned a moment ago, the cure claims.

So there's a lot of debt out there. If the FCC wants to look at windfall then they're going to have to look at all these debts too. And then when -- windfall doesn't really bother me a lot. I'm not so sure there's a great amount of windfall here. But I think about Choctaw and their involvement in this case, there are a lot of reason for them to be involved in this case.

Number one it's sort of self preservation at one point. But they're taking a risk. And sometimes when you take a risk, you expect a little may not -- no telling how big the pot of gold might be at the end of the rainbow, it might be little bitty, it might be good. But you're not out there for philanthropic effect on the economy. You're there to make a living and make money and, I mean, I understand that and I think that's what makes our country go. consider all those factors and I hope the FCC will, because I'm considering them in my decision here today.

Look at the personal guarantee issue that's been talked about a lot. Don Deprees may very well receive an indirect benefit and if this transaction succeeds, this plan succeeds and these creditors are paid. But who knows? I

2

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

212-267-6868

haven't heard one shred of proof in the last two days as to what Mr. Deprees guarantee is really worth. Is it worth \$10 million? I don't know. I haven't heard that.

But, you know, he may be off the hook, but are we to choose to punish legitimate creditors just so someone might not get an indirect benefit? No. I agree with the witness who testified yesterday that said that's a small issue. And if these creditors are paid, then they ought to get paid and they certainly shouldn't be punished.

Issue G that was just talked about a moment ago.

I don't have any idea what's going to happen with that and nobody else does. So we're talking about some unknowns today.

I can't certainly say with any great degree of assurance that Second Thursday is going to be granted by the FCC, but the proof that has been presented to this Court in this last two days that it is more likely than not, that Second Thursday will be granted.

Footnote 7 is certainly a viable alternative, particularly for Southern California Regional Railway Authority and that is another reason to move this forward.

Feasibility. I thought the testimony of Mr.

Trammell yesterday was very compelling and it's somewhat

like a balloon that you keep inflating. You can only go so

far. It doesn't mean that the balloon is endless. At some

1.

point it might pop. And he said he didn't want to be here 15 years from now and I'm sure he does not. And I'm sure Choctaw doesn't want to be here 15 years from now. But the testimony was undisputed that he's there, that he's not going away and that he has and that Choctaw has resources to make this thing go forward. So that testimony was compelling. It resonated with me.

I look at the votes -- and that's another compelling thing -- that have been presented by the tally of ballots. Every class voted to accept confirmation by the respected requirements of the law. That is the dollar amount within the class voting and the number of creditors in the class voting. When a court sees that, that's certainly a motivation to confirm a plan.

Look at the objections that have been filed. And I certainly accept the objection of -- the resolution of the objection by the FCC. And I understand it and I hope that you can work out the language. If you can't and you need assistance I am available to help you. But I think that's a job well done to get that objection resolved and contingent as it may be at this moment. You resolved the other objections, Alice Pipeline, the U.S. Trustee, Coserve (ph), they're no longer in the courtroom with us.

In my opinion from what I've heard at this confirmation hearing the requirements of Section 1129(a) of

the Bankruptcy Code have been met to my satisfaction.

.

This is not a chicken or an egg conundrum here.

This plan is the first step in a long pathway to making this thing actually work.

I understand that. I understand that there are some unknowns. The issue of the penalties that could come out of the FCC. What's going to come out of the District Court of New Jersey with the Skytel law suit there? I don't know. None of us know what's going to come out of that.

This court reserves the right to look at that depending on what happens at a later date. But that's not - it is what it is. You've created a resolution of your objection that the FCC reserves these rights to do what they think they need to do and that's fine. I think that's an intelligent resolution of the objection and a way to go forward.

Now, what happens in the District Court in New Jersey? It is what it is. We'll just have to see. And it may not be a problem at all, but I don't know that. But I am of the opinion that if this plan is not confirmed and confirmed today by my bench decision then everybody loses.

So my decision is that the plan of -- filed by the debtor and proposed by -- in conjunction with Choctaw will be confirmed by this Court and an order will be entered accordingly.

	1430 100
1	Are there questions? Number one thing. The
2	objection to Skytel which is the only objection remaining is
3	overruled.
4	Any questions?
5	MR. RUHL: Quick question, Your Honor. You said
6	that you were reserving your right to look at the New Jersey
7	decision if and when that ever happens?
8	THE COURT: Yeah.
9	MR. RUHL: Does that mean what effect on the
10	treble damages disallowance provision (indiscernible)
11	reserve your right to (indiscernible).
12	THE COURT: Just look at it and see what happens.
13	MR. RUHL: Yes, sir. And the second thing
14	THE COURT: It won't be me.
15	(laughter)
16	MR. RUHL: The second thing is the Court okay with
17	the same reservation of rights that we had before on the
18	Skytel proceedings like we did in the APA orders?
19	THE COURT: I just said that what happens there
20	can happen there. I'm not trying to tell the New Jersey
21	district court that they can't decide that case and do what
22	they want to do.
23	MR. RUHL: And they're FCC proceedings too, Your
24	Honor.
25	THE COURT: Exactly. I made that explicitly clear

	Page 190
1	I thought a moment ago.
2	MR. GENO: One question, Your Honor. We had
3	requested that the Court find that Choctaw was a good faith
4	purchaser. And I know that you didn't specifically find
5	that. We'd like
6	THE COURT: I do now.
7	MR. GENO: Thank you. Nothing further, Your
8	Honor.
9	THE COURT: I think that Mr. Trammell's testimony
10	convinces me that they're a good faith purchaser and trying
11	to do the right thing by this.
12	All right. You all are free to go. Have a great
13	weekend.
14	(Chorus of thank you.)
15	(Proceedings concluded at 3:47 p.m.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATION
2	I, Sherri L. Breach, CERT*D-397, certified that the
3	foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the
4	proceedings.
5 6	Their X Bleach
7	SHERRI L. BREACH
8	AAERT Certified Electronic Reporter & Transcriber
9	CERT*D -397
10	
11	I, Melissa Looney, certify that the foregoing transcript is
12	a true and accurate record of the proceedings.
13	
14 15	Melissa Loone y MELISSA LOONEY
16	AAERT Certified Electronic Reporter & Transcriber
17	CET**D-607
18	
19	Veritext
20	200 Old Country Road
21	Suite 580
22	Mineola, NY 11501
23	
24	Date: November 30, 2012
25	